

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 12, 26, 87-89, 91, 93, 98 and 102 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 87 are amended. Support for amended claims 1 and 87 can be found, for example, in the specification page 66 and in Figs. 4A-4C.

The courtesies extended to Applicants' representative by Examiners Diacou and Luu at the interview held February 7, 2007, are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

In the October 24, 2006 Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 12, 87-89, 91 and 98 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Shimizu (EP 0835796) in view of Schofield (W0 96/38319) and Kakinami et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,855). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

As agreed during the personal interview, with respect to independent claim 1 and for similarly recited features in independent claim 87, the cited prior art does not teach a drive assist means for overlaying **on top of the image picked up by the camera** guide lines prolonged from lines defining the width of a vehicle body on the image area existing in the vehicle advancing direction.

With respect to Shimizu, the Examiner concedes on page 6 of the Office Action that Shimizu fails to teach guide lines that are prolonged from the lines defining the width of the vehicle body. Furthermore, as agreed during the personal interview, Shimizu does not teach or make it possible to infer that the lines defining width of the vehicle are representative of the vehicle width on which the vehicle drive assist device is installed, as recited in claims 1 and 87.

With respect to Schofield, Schofield teaches in Fig. 3 that lines 50 and 52 dynamically adjust with respect to distance Q. Because the width of a car does not change dynamically

with respect to distance Q, the overlaid lines 50 and 52 are not guide lines projecting from lines defining the width of the vehicle on which the vehicle drive assist device is installed.

Furthermore, with respect to Kakinami, Fig. 2 and Schofield, Figs. 3, 8, 12 and 23, the Examiner suggests that road lane markings are lines overlaid on the display means prolonged from lines defining the width of a vehicle. This is not correct. First of all, the road lane markings are not overlaid on top of the image picked up by the camera but rather are part of the image captured by the cameras. Second of all, as is well known in the art, road lane markings do not define the width of a vehicle but define an area in which the vehicle is to remain within. For example, Fig. 3 of Schofield shows three different vehicles all of which are located within road lane markings that do not define the width of the vehicle.

The width between the road lane markings in Schofield and Kakinami is a fixed value, regardless of the width of the vehicle on which the vehicle drive assist device is installed. On the other hand, the width between the guide lines in the present invention varies in accordance with the width of the vehicle on which the vehicle drive assist device is installed. For example, if the drive assist device is installed on a large dump truck, the width of which is longer than the width between the road lane markings, the guide line, the width of which is longer than the width between the road lane markings, is overlaid on top of the image picked up by the camera. Therefore, the Applicant believes that none of the cited references discloses guide lines prolonged from lines defining width of the vehicle on which the vehicle drive assist device is installed, as recited in claim 1 and 87.

With respect to Schofield Fig. 6, graphic overlay 70A and 70B are hash marks intended to illustrate to the driver the anticipated path of movement of vehicle 10. Therefore, overlays 70A and 70B move to show the anticipated vehicle path but do not represent guide lines projecting from lines defining the width of the vehicle body on the image area, wherein

the lines defining the width of the vehicle body represent the actual width of the vehicle body on which the vehicle drive assist device is installed, as recited in claims 1 and 87.

We respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing and the January 24, 2007 Amendment, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

John A. Radi
Registration No. 59,345

JAO:JAR/tbm

Date: February 22, 2007

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
